

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

DEC 21 2010

DAVID J. MALAND, CLERK

BY DEPUTY

Ba

SYNQOR, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO. 2:07-CV-497-TJW-CE

ARTESYN TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
ASTEC AMERICA, INC.,
BEL FUSE, INC.,
CHEROKEE INTERNATIONAL COPR.,
DELTA ELECTRONICS, INC.,
LINEAGE POWER CORP.,
MURATA ELECTRONICS NORTH
AMERICA, INC.,
MURATA MANUFACTURING CO., LTD.,
MURATA POWER SOLUTIONS INC.,
and POWER-ONE, INC.

Defendants.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

VERDICT FORM

Question No. 1:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following product that was made, used, or sold by Artesyn directly infringes claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 ("the '083 patent")?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

TQN20A48S12:

Yes

Question No. 2:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following product that was made, used, or sold by Astec directly infringes claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 ("the '083 patent")?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

AEQ/ALQ42B50: Yes

Question No. 3:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following products that were made, used, or sold by Cherokee directly infringe claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 ("the '083 patent")?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

CBQ2548G1:	<u>Yes</u>
CBQ4248G1:	<u>Yes</u>
165412-Y:	<u>Yes</u>
SP628 (w/2 CBQ2548G1N):	<u>Yes</u>
SP639 (w/2 CBQ2548G1N):	<u>Yes</u>
SP664 (w/1 CBQ2548G1N):	<u>Yes</u>
SP686 (w/1 165412-Y):	<u>Yes</u>
SP704 (w/1 165412-Y):	<u>Yes</u>

Question No. 4:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following products that were made, used, or sold by Lineage directly infringe claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 ("the '083 patent")?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

EUE120B41: Yes

EUE200B41: Yes

EUK240S9R0 : Yes

QUK240S9R0: Yes

SP735 (w/1 CBQ4248G1): Yes

Question No. 5:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following products that were made, used, or sold by Delta directly infringe claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 ("the '083 patent")?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

E48SB12020xxxx:	<u>yes</u>
Q48SB12020xRxx:	<u>yes</u>
Q48SB12025xxxx:	<u>yes</u>
Q48SB12040xxxx:	<u>yes</u>
Q48SB9R650xxxx:	<u>yes</u>
DPSN-470AP (w/1 Q48SB12020-NRFE):	<u>yes</u>

Question No. 6:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following products that were made, used, or sold by Murata Power Solutions ("MPS") directly infringe claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 ("the '083 patent")?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

EUS15-120: yes

EUS20-120: yes

EUS25-096: yes

EUS30-080: yes

EUS34-096: yes

QUS40-096: yes

Question No. 7:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following product that was made, used, or sold by Murata directly infringes claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 ("the '083 patent")?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

MPDNB001S:

Yes

Question No. 8:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the following products that were made, used, or sold by Power-One directly infringe claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 ("the '083 patent")?

Answer "Yes" or "No" to each listed product below:

QTS48T25120: Yes

QTS48T38096: Yes

QTS48T46096: Yes

QTS48T67096: Yes

SQT48T20120: Yes

SQT48T27096: Yes

SQT48T38096: Yes

Question No. 9:

Do you find that SynQor has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the Bel Fuse product identified as 42R8295 that was made, used, or sold by Bel Fuse directly infringes the following claims?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: yes

Claim 8: yes

Claim 19: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: yes

Claim 30: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: yes

Claim 71: yes

Question No. 10:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Artesyn induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: Yes

Question No. 11:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Artesyn contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: Yes

Question No. 12:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Astec induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: yes

Claim 8: yes

Claim 10: yes

Claim 19: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: yes

Claim 30: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: yes

Claim 71: yes

Question No. 13:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Astec contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: yes

Claim 8: yes

Claim 10: yes

Claim 19: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: yes

Claim 30: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: yes

Claim 71: yes

Question No. 14:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Bel Fuse induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: yes

Claim 8: yes

Claim 10: yes

Claim 19: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: yes

Claim 30: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: yes

Claim 71: yes

Question No. 15:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Bel Fuse contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

Question No. 16:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Cherokee induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

Question No. 17:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Cherokee contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

Question No. 18:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Lineage induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: yes

Claim 19: yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: Yes

Question No. 19:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Lineage contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: Yes

Question No. 20:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Delta induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: Yes

Question No. 21:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Delta contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: Yes

Question No. 22:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Murata Power Solutions (“MPS”) induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer “Yes” or “No” for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the ‘190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the ‘021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the ‘083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the ‘702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

Question No. 23:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Murata Power Solutions ("MPS") contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

Question No. 24:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Murata induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

Question No. 25:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Murata contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

Question No. 26:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Power-One induced infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: Yes

Question No. 27:

Do you find by a preponderance of evidence that Power-One contributed to infringement of the patents-in-suit?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim of each patent:

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: Yes

Claim 8: Yes

Claim 10: Yes

Claim 19: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: Yes

Claim 30: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: Yes

Claim 71: Yes

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: Yes

Question No. 28:

Do you find that the Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims are invalid because they were in public use more than one year before the applicable priority date?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim:

"Yes" means the claim is invalid, and "No" means the claim is not invalid.

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: No

Claim 8: No

Claim 10: No

Claim 19: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: No

Claim 30: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: No

Claim 71: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: No

Question No. 29:

Do you find that the Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims are invalid because they were on sale more than one year before the applicable priority date?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim:

"Yes" means the claim is invalid, and "No" means the claim is not invalid.

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: No

Claim 8: No

Claim 10: No

Claim 19: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: No

Claim 30: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: No

Claim 71: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: No

Question No. 30:

Do you find that the Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims are invalid because they were anticipated by the prior art?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim:

"Yes" means the claim is invalid, and "No" means the claim is not invalid.

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: No

Claim 8: No

Claim 10: No

Claim 19: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: No

Claim 30: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: No

Claim 71: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: No

Question No. 31:

Do you find that the Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims are invalid because they would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field at the time of the invention?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim:

"Yes" means the claim is invalid, and "No" means the claim is not invalid.

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: No

Claim 8: No

Claim 10: No

Claim 19: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: No

Claim 30: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: No

Claim 71: No

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: No

Question No. 32:

Do you find that the Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims are invalid because they fail to meet the written description requirement?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each asserted claim:

"Yes" means the claim is invalid, and "No" means the claim is not invalid.

U.S. Patent No. 7,072,190 (the '190 patent)

Claim 2: N O

Claim 8: N O

Claim 10: N O

Claim 19: N O

U.S. Patent No. 7,272,021 (the '021 patent)

Claim 21: N O

Claim 30: N O

U.S. Patent No. 7,558,083 (the '083 patent)

Claim 1: N O

U.S. Patent No. 7,564,702 (the '702 patent)

Claim 56: N O

Claim 71: N O

U.S. Patent No. 7,269,034 (the '034 patent)

Claim 9: N O

Question No. 33:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement you have found caused by Artesyn?

Answer in dollars, if any, for lost profits.

Answer: \$ 306,194.⁰⁰

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 162,096.⁰⁰

Question No. 34:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement you have found caused by Astec?

Answer in dollars, if any, for lost profits.

Answer: \$ 12,979,404.⁰⁰

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 479,859.⁰⁰

Question No. 35:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement you have found caused by Cherokee?

Answer in dollars, if any, for lost profits.

Answer: \$ 12,527,324. 00

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 870,389. 00

Question No. 36:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement you have found caused by Lineage?

Answer in dollars, if any, for lost profits.

Answer: \$ 9,248,124. 00

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 1,184,000. 00

Question No. 37:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement you have found caused by Delta?

Answer in dollars, if any, for lost profits.

Answer: \$ 4,427,614.00

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 1,313,676.00

Question No. 38:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement you have found caused by Murata Power Solutions?

Answer in dollars, if any, for lost profits.

Answer: \$ 17,113,179.⁰⁰

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 817,433.⁰⁰

Question No. 39:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement you have found caused by Murata?

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 47,412.00

Question No. 40:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement you have found caused by Power-One?

Answer in dollars, if any, for lost profits.

Answer: \$ 23,647,351.00

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 1,997,926.00

Question No. 41:

What sum of money, if any, if paid now in cash, would fairly and reasonably compensate SynQor for any infringement caused by Bel Fuse?

Answer in dollars, if any, for lost profits.

Answer: \$ 6,891,756.00

Answer in dollars, if any, for a reasonable royalty.

Answer: \$ 1,211,126.02

The jury foreperson should sign and date the Verdict Form and return it to the Security Officer.

Signed this 21 day of December, 2010.